Submitted to 'Chinese Physics C'

Top quark decay to a 125 GeV Higgs in BLMSSM

Tie-Jun Gao[a,b,c], Tai-Fu Feng[a,b], Fei Sun[a,c], Hai-Bin Zhang[a,c], Shu-Min Zhao[a,b]

[a] *Department of Physics, Hebei University, Baoding, 071002, China*

[b] *Institute of theoretical Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, 100190, China*

[c] *Department of Physics, Dalian University of Technology, Dalian, 116024, China*

arXiv:1404.3289v3 [hep-ph] 6 Oct 2014

Abstract

In this paper, we calculate the top quark rare decay $t \to ch$ in a supersymmetric extension of the standard model where baryon and lepton numbers are local gauge symmetries. Adopting reasonable assumptions on the parameter space, we find that the branching ratios of $t \to ch$ can reach 10^{-3}, which can be detected in near future.

PACS numbers: 14.65.Ha 12.60.Jv

Keywords: Supersymmetry, BLMSSM, top quark decays

I. INTRODUCTION

Top quark plays a special role in the standard model(SM) and holds great promise in revealing the secret of new physics beyond the SM. The running LHC is a top-quark factory, and provides a great opportunity to seek out top-quark rare decays. Among those rare processes, the flavor-changing neutral current (FCNC) decays $t \to ch$ deserve special attention, since the branching ratios(BRs) of those rare processes are strongly suppressed in the SM. In addition, ATLAS and CMS have reported significant excess events which are interpreted probably to be related to the neutral Higgs with mass $m_{h_0} \sim 124-126$ GeV[1, 2]. This implies that the Higgs mechanism to break electroweak symmetry possibly has a solid experimental cornerstone.

In the framework of the SM, the possibility of detecting FCNC decays $t \to ch$ is essentially hopeless, since tree level FCNC involving the quarks are forbidden by the gauge symmetries and particle content[3, 4]. In particular, it has recently been recognized that the BRs of the process is much smaller [5, 6] than originally thought [7] which is less then 10^{-13}. In extensions of the SM, the BRs for FCNC top decays can be orders of magnitude larger. For example, the authors of Ref.[8], study $t \to ch$ process in the framework of the minimal supersymmetric extension of the standard model(MSSM) include the leading set of supersymmetric QCD and supersymmetric electroweak contributions, and get $\mathrm{Br}^{SUSY-EW}(t \to ch) \sim 10^{-8}$, $\mathrm{Br}^{SUSY-QCD}(t \to ch) \sim 10^{-5}$. And a new work about this process in MSSM is discussed in Ref.[9], with $\tan\beta = 1.5$ *or* 35 and the mass of SUSY particles about 1 or 2TeV scale, the authors get the branching ratio of $t \to ch$ can only reach 3×10^{-6}, which is much smaller than previous results obtained before the advent of the LHC.

Physicists have been interested in the MSSM [10–13] for a long time. However, since the matter-antimatter is asymmetry in the universe, baryon number (B) should be broken. On the other hand, since heavy majorana neutrinos contained in the seesaw mechanism can induce the tiny neutrino masses[14, 15] to explain the neutrino oscillation experiment, so the lepton number (L) is also expected to be broken. A minimal supersymmetric extension

of the SM with local gauged B and L(BLMSSM) is more favorite[16, 17]. Since the new quarks are vector-like with respect to the strong, weak and electromagnetic interactions to cancel anomalies, one obtains that their masses can be above 500 GeV without assuming large couplings to the Higgs doublets in this model. Therefore, there are no Landau poles for the Yukawa couplings here.

In BLMSSM, B and L are spontaneously broken near the weak scale, the proton decay is forbidden, and the three neutrinos get mass from the extended seesaw mechanism at tree level[3, 4, 16, 17]. Therefore, the desert between the grand unified scale and the electroweak scale is not necessary, which is the main motivation for the BLMSSM.

The CMS[18] and ATLAS[19] experiments of LHC have studied many possible signals of the MSSM, and set very strong bounds on the gluino and squarks masses with R-parity conservation. However, in the BLMSSM, the predictions and bounds for the collider experiments should be changed[16, 17, 20]. In addition, the lepton number violation could be detected at the LHC from the decays of right handed neutrinos[3, 4, 21], and we could also look for the baryon number violation in the decays of squarks and gauginos[22]. Since there are some exotic fields, and exist couplings between exotic quark fields and SM quarks in the superpotential, so it will cause flavor changing processes, and the BRs for FCNC top decays can be orders of magnitude larger.

In this paper we analyze the corrections to the top-quark decay $t \to ch$ in BLMSSM. This paper is composed of the sections as follows. In section II, we present the main ingredients of the BLMSSM. In section III, we present the theoretical calculation on the $t \to ch$ processes. Section IV is devoted to the numerical analysis. Our conclusions are summarized in Section V.

II. A SUPERSYMMTRIC EXTENSION OF THE SM WHERE B AND L ARE LOCAL GAUGE SYMMETRIES

The local gauge B and L is base on the gauge group: $SU(3)_C \otimes SU(2)_L \otimes U(1)_Y \otimes U(1)_B \otimes U(1)_L$. In BLMSSM, to cancel the B and L anomalies, the exotic superfields should

include the new quarks $\hat{Q}_4$, $\hat{U}_4^c$, $\hat{D}_4^c$, $\hat{Q}_5^c$, $\hat{U}_5$, $\hat{D}_5$, and the new leptons $\hat{L}_4$, $\hat{E}_4^c$, $\hat{N}_4^c$, $\hat{L}_5^c$, $\hat{E}_5$, $\hat{N}_5$. In addition, the new Higgs chiral superfields $\hat{\Phi}_B$ and $\hat{\varphi}_B$ acquire nonzero vacuum expectation values (VEVs) to break baryon number spontaneously, the superfields $\hat{\Phi}_L$ and $\hat{\varphi}_L$ acquire nonzero VEVs to break lepton number spontaneously. The model also introduce the superfields $\hat{X}$, $\hat{X}'$ to avoid stability for the exotic quarks. Actually, the lightest superfields can be a candidate for dark matter . The properties of these superfields in BLMSSM are summarized in Table I.

TABLE I: The properties of superfields in BLMSSM

superfield	$SU(3)$	$SU(2)$	$U(1)_Y$	$U(1)_B$	$U(1)_L$
$\hat{Q}_4$	3	2	1/6	B_4	0
$\hat{U}_4^c$	$\bar{3}$	1	-2/3	$-B_4$	0
$\hat{D}_4^c$	$\bar{3}$	1	1/3	$-B_4$	0
$\hat{Q}_5^c$	$\bar{3}$	2	-1/6	$-(1+B_4)$	0
$\hat{U}_5$	3	1	2/3	$1+B_4$	0
$\hat{D}_5$	3	1	-1/3	$1+B_4$	0
$\hat{L}_4$	1	2	-1/2	0	L_4
$\hat{E}_4^c$	1	1	1	0	$-L_4$
$\hat{N}_4^c$	1	1	0	0	$-L_4$
$\hat{L}_5^c$	1	2	1/2	0	$-(3+L_4)$
$\hat{E}_5$	1	1	-1	0	$3+L_4$
$\hat{N}_5$	1	1	0	0	$3+L_4$
$\hat{\Phi}_B$	1	1	0	1	0
$\hat{\varphi}_B$	1	1	0	-1	0
$\hat{\Phi}_L$	1	1	0	0	-2
$\hat{\varphi}_L$	1	1	0	0	2
$\hat{X}$	1	1	0	$2/3+B_4$	0
$\hat{X}'$	1	1	0	$-(2/3+B_4)$	0

In BLMSSM, the super potential is written as [23, 24]

$$\mathcal{W}_{BLMSSM} = \mathcal{W}_{MSSM} + \mathcal{W}_B + \mathcal{W}_L + \mathcal{W}_X \ , \tag{1}$$

where $\mathcal{W}_{MSSM}$ is superpotential of the MSSM, and the concrete form of $\mathcal{W}_B$, $\mathcal{W}_L$ and $\mathcal{W}_X$ are

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{W}_B =& \lambda_Q \hat{Q}_4 \hat{Q}^c_5 \hat{\Phi}_B + \lambda_U \hat{U}^c_4 \hat{U}_5 \hat{\varphi}_B + \lambda_D \hat{D}^c_4 \hat{D}_5 \hat{\varphi}_B + \mu_B \hat{\Phi}_B \hat{\varphi}_B \\
&+ Y_{u_4} \hat{Q}_4 \hat{H}_u \hat{U}^c_4 + Y_{d_4} \hat{Q}_4 \hat{H}_d \hat{D}^c_4 + Y_{u_5} \hat{Q}^c_5 \hat{H}_d \hat{U}_5 + Y_{d_5} \hat{Q}^c_5 \hat{H}_u \hat{D}_5 \ , \\
\mathcal{W}_L =& Y_{e_4} \hat{L}_4 \hat{H}_d \hat{E}^c_4 + Y_{\nu_4} \hat{L}_4 \hat{H}_u \hat{\nu}^c_4 + Y_{e_5} \hat{L}^c_5 \hat{H}_u \hat{E}_5 + Y_{\nu_5} \hat{L}^c_5 \hat{H}_d \hat{\nu}_5 \\
&+ Y_\nu \hat{L} \hat{H}_u \hat{\nu}^c + \lambda_{\nu^c} \hat{\nu}^c \hat{\nu}^c \hat{\varphi}_L + \mu_L \hat{\Phi}_L \hat{\varphi}_L \ , \\
\mathcal{W}_X =& \lambda_1 \hat{Q} \hat{Q}^c_5 \hat{X} + \lambda_2 \hat{U}^c \hat{U}_5 \hat{X}' + \lambda_3 \hat{D}^c \hat{D}_5 \hat{X}' + \mu_X \hat{X} \hat{X}' \ ,
\end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

and we could see that since $\mathcal{W}_X$ contains superfields X and Q_5 (U_5, D_5 and X') couple to all generations of SM quarks, so FCNC processes can be generated.

Correspondingly, the soft breaking terms $\mathcal{L}_{soft}$ are generally given as

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}_{soft} =& \mathcal{L}^{MSSM}_{soft} - (m^2_{\tilde{\nu}^c})_{IJ} \tilde{\nu}^{c*}_I \tilde{\nu}^c_J - m^2_{\tilde{Q}_4} \tilde{Q}^\dagger_4 \tilde{Q}_4 - m^2_{\tilde{U}_4} \tilde{U}^{c*}_4 \tilde{U}^c_4 - m^2_{\tilde{D}_4} \tilde{D}^{c*}_4 \tilde{D}^c_4 \\
&- m^2_{\tilde{Q}_5} \tilde{Q}^{c\dagger}_5 \tilde{Q}^c_5 - m^2_{\tilde{U}_5} \tilde{U}^*_5 \tilde{U}_5 - m^2_{\tilde{D}_5} \tilde{D}^*_5 \tilde{D}_5 - m^2_{\tilde{L}_4} \tilde{L}^\dagger_4 \tilde{L}_4 - m^2_{\tilde{\nu}_4} \tilde{\nu}^{c*}_4 \tilde{\nu}^c_4 \\
&- m^2_{\tilde{E}_4} \tilde{e}^{c*}_4 \tilde{e}^c_4 - m^2_{\tilde{L}_5} \tilde{L}^{c\dagger}_5 \tilde{L}^c_5 - m^2_{\tilde{\nu}_5} \tilde{\nu}^*_5 \tilde{\nu}_5 - m^2_{\tilde{E}_5} \tilde{e}^*_5 \tilde{e}_5 - m^2_{\Phi_B} \Phi^*_B \Phi_B \\
&- m^2_{\varphi_B} \varphi^*_B \varphi_B - m^2_{\Phi_L} \Phi^*_L \Phi_L - m^2_{\varphi_L} \varphi^*_L \varphi_L - \Big(m_B \lambda_B \lambda_B + m_L \lambda_L \lambda_L + h.c. \Big) \\
&+ \Big\{ A_{u_4} Y_{u_4} \tilde{Q}_4 H_u \tilde{U}^c_4 + A_{d_4} Y_{d_4} \tilde{Q}_4 H_d \tilde{D}^c_4 + A_{u_5} Y_{u_5} \tilde{Q}^c_5 H_d \tilde{U}_5 + A_{d_5} Y_{d_5} \tilde{Q}^c_5 H_u \tilde{D}_5 \\
&+ A_{BQ} \lambda_Q \tilde{Q}_4 \tilde{Q}^c_5 \Phi_B + A_{BU} \lambda_U \tilde{U}^c_4 \tilde{U}_5 \varphi_B + A_{BD} \lambda_D \tilde{D}^c_4 \tilde{D}_5 \varphi_B + B_B \mu_B \Phi_B \varphi_B + h.c. \Big\} \\
&+ \Big\{ A_{e_4} Y_{e_4} \tilde{L}_4 H_d \tilde{E}^c_4 + A_{\nu_4} Y_{\nu_4} \tilde{L}_4 H_u \tilde{\nu}^c_4 + A_{e_5} Y_{e_5} \tilde{L}^c_5 H_u \tilde{E}_5 + A_{\nu_5} Y_{\nu_5} \tilde{L}^c_5 H_d \tilde{\nu}_5 \\
&+ A_\nu Y_\nu \tilde{L} H_u \tilde{\nu}^c + A_{\nu^c} \lambda_{\nu^c} \tilde{\nu}^c \tilde{\nu}^c \varphi_L + B_L \mu_L \Phi_L \varphi_L + h.c. \Big\} \\
&+ \Big\{ A_1 \lambda_1 \tilde{Q} \tilde{Q}^c_5 X + A_2 \lambda_2 \tilde{U}^c \tilde{U}_5 X' + A_3 \lambda_3 \tilde{D}^c \tilde{D}_5 X' + B_X \mu_X X X' + h.c. \Big\} \ ,
\end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

with $\mathcal{L}^{MSSM}_{soft}$ representing the soft breaking terms of the MSSM, and λ_B, λ_L are gauginos of $U(1)_B$ and $U(1)_L$, respectively.

To break the local gauge symmetry $SU(2)_{_L} \otimes U(1)_{_Y} \otimes U(1)_{_B} \otimes U(1)_{_L}$ down to the electromagnetic symmetry $U(1)_{_e}$, the $SU(2)_L$ doublets $H_{_u}$, $H_{_d}$ and the $SU(2)_L$ singlets $\Phi_{_B}$, $\varphi_{_B}$, $\Phi_{_L}$, $\varphi_{_L}$ should obtain the nonzero VEVs $\upsilon_{_u}$, $\upsilon_{_d}$, $\upsilon_{_B}$, $\overline{\upsilon}_{_B}$, and $\upsilon_{_L}$, $\overline{\upsilon}_{_L}$ respectively.

$$
\begin{aligned}
H_{_u} &= \begin{pmatrix} H_{_u}^{+} \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\Big(\upsilon_{_u} + H_{_u}^{0} + iP_{_u}^{0}\Big) \end{pmatrix} , \\
H_{_d} &= \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\Big(\upsilon_{_d} + H_{_d}^{0} + iP_{_d}^{0}\Big) \\ H_{_d}^{-} \end{pmatrix} , \\
\Phi_{_B} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\Big(\upsilon_{_B} + \Phi_{_B}^{0} + iP_{_B}^{0}\Big) , \\
\varphi_{_B} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\Big(\overline{\upsilon}_{_B} + \varphi_{_B}^{0} + i\overline{P}_{_B}^{0}\Big) , \\
\Phi_{_L} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\Big(\upsilon_{_L} + \Phi_{_L}^{0} + iP_{_L}^{0}\Big) , \\
\varphi_{_L} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\Big(\overline{\upsilon}_{_L} + \varphi_{_L}^{0} + i\overline{P}_{_L}^{0}\Big) ,
\end{aligned} \tag{4}
$$

The mass matrixes of Higgs, exotic quarks and exotic scalar quarks are obtained in our previous work[23], and we list some useful results.

In four-component Dirac spinors, the mass matrix for exotic charged 2/3 quarks is

$$
-L_{t''}^{mass} = \Big(\bar{t}''_{4R},\ \bar{t}''_{5R} \Big) \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}Y_{u_4}\upsilon_u, & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\lambda_Q\upsilon_B \\ -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\lambda_u\bar{\upsilon}_B, & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}Y_{u_5}\upsilon_d \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} t''_{4L} \\ t''_{5L} \end{pmatrix} + h.c. \tag{5}
$$

and it could be diagonalized by the the unitary transformations

$$
\begin{pmatrix} t'_{4L} \\ t'_{5L} \end{pmatrix} = U_{t'}^{\dagger} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} t''_{4L} \\ t''_{5L} \end{pmatrix} , \quad \begin{pmatrix} t'_{4R} \\ t'_{5R} \end{pmatrix} = W_{t'}^{\dagger} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} t''_{4R} \\ t''_{5R} \end{pmatrix} , \tag{6}
$$

then we get

$$
W_{t'}^{\dagger} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}Y_{u_4}\upsilon_u, & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\lambda_Q\upsilon_B \\ -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\lambda_u\bar{\upsilon}_B, & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}Y_{u_5}\upsilon_d \end{pmatrix} \cdot U_{t'} = diag(m_{t_4},\ m_{t_5}) \tag{7}
$$

Similarly, The concrete expressions for 4×4 mass squared matrice $M_{\tilde{t}'}^2$ of exotic charged 2/3 scalar quarks $\tilde{t}''^{T} = (\tilde{Q}_4^1,\ \tilde{U}_4^{c*},\ \tilde{Q}_5^{2c*},\ \tilde{U}_5)$ are given in appendix B of Ref[23], and it could

be diagonalized by the the unitary transformation

$$\tilde{t}''_i = Z^{ij}_{\tilde{t}'} \tilde{t}'_j, \tag{8}$$

Using the scalar potential and the soft breaking terms, the mass squared matrix for X, X' could be written as

$$-L_X^{mass} = \begin{pmatrix} X^* & X' \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mu_X^2 + S_X & -B_X\mu_X \\ -B_X\mu_X & \mu_X^2 - S_X \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} X \\ X' \end{pmatrix} \tag{9}$$

with $S_X = \frac{g_B^2}{2}(\frac{2}{3} + B_4)(v_B^2 - \overline{v}_B^2)$. And it could be diagonalized by the unitary transformation Z_X

$$Z_X^\dagger \begin{pmatrix} \mu_X^2 + S_X & -B_X\mu_X \\ -B_X\mu_X & \mu_X^2 - S_X \end{pmatrix} Z_X = diag(m_{X_1}^2,\ m_{X_2}^2)\ . \tag{10}$$

In addition, the four-component Dirac spinor $\widetilde{X}$ is defined as $\widetilde{X} = (\psi_X, \bar{\psi}_{X'})^T$, with the mass term $\mu_X \widetilde{X}\overline{\widetilde{X}}$.

The flavor conservative couplings between the lightest neutral Higgs and charged 2/3 exotic quarks are

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{Ht't'} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \sum_{i,j=1}^{2} \Big\{ & \Big[Y_{u_4} (W_t^\dagger)_{i2} (U_t)_{1j} \cos\alpha + Y_{u_5} (W_t^\dagger)_{i1} (U_t)_{2j} \sin\alpha \Big] h^0 \overline{t'}_i P_L t'_j \\ & + \Big[Y_{u_4} (U_t^\dagger)_{i1} (W_t)_{2j} \cos\alpha + Y_{u_5} (U_t^\dagger)_{i2} (W_t)_{1j} \sin\alpha \Big] h^0 \overline{t'}_i P_R t'_j \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

with α is defined as

$$\begin{pmatrix} H^0 \\ h^0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos\alpha & \sin\alpha \\ -\sin\alpha & \cos\alpha \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} H_d^0 \\ H_u^0 \end{pmatrix}\ , \tag{12}$$

And the couplings between the lightest neutral Higgs and exotic scalar quarks are

$$\mathcal{L}_{H\tilde{t}'^*_i \tilde{t}'} = \sum_{i,j}^{4} \Big[\xi^S_{uij} \cos\alpha - \xi^S_{dij} \sin\alpha \Big] h^0 \tilde{t}'^*_i \tilde{t}'_j \tag{13}$$

with ξ^S_{uij} and ξ^S_{dij} are defined in appendix C of Ref[23].



FIG. 1: The vertex diagrams contributing to the $t \to ch$ decay in BLMSSM.

In mass basis, we obtain the couplings of quark-exotic quark and the X:

$$-\lambda_1 (W_{t'})_{i2} (Z_X)_{1j} X_j \bar{t}'_i P_L u - \lambda_2 (U^{\dagger}_{t'})_{2i} (Z_X)_{2j} X_j \, \bar{u} P_L t'_i + h.c. \tag{14}$$

and the couplings between up type quark and the superpartners $\widetilde{t}', \widetilde{X}$ are

$$-\lambda_1 (Z^{\dagger}_{\tilde{t}'})_{i3} \tilde{t}'_i \, \bar{u} P_L \tilde{X} - \lambda_2 (Z^{\dagger}_{\tilde{t}'})_{i4} \tilde{t}'_i \bar{\tilde{X}} P_L u + h.c. \tag{15}$$

III. THE THEORETICAL CALCULATION ON THE $t \to ch$ PROCESS

In this section, we present one-loop radiative corrections to the rare decay $t \to ch$ in BLMSSM. For this process, it is convenient to define an effective interaction vertex [8]:

$$-iT = -ig\bar{c}(p) \left(F_L P_L + F_R P_R\right) t(p') \tag{16}$$

where p' is the momentum of the initial top quark, p is the momentum of the final state charm quark, and form factors F_L, F_R are follow from explicit calculation of vertices and mixed self-energies.

The relevant one-loop vertex diagrams of BLMSSM are drawn in Fig.1.

We could see that the FCNC transitions of new physics are mediated by the exotic up type quark t', the neutral scalar particle X_i and there superpartners $\widetilde{t}', \widetilde{X}$. And the contribution to the form factors could be obtained by direct calculation.

In the equations below, $m_{t'}$, m_X, $m_{\widetilde{t'}}$, $m_{\widetilde{X}}$ denotes the mass of the exotic quarks t', the mass of scalar particle X_i, and the mass of there superpartners $\widetilde{t'}, \widetilde{X}$ respectively. B_i, C_{ij} are the coefficients of the Lorentz-covariant tensors in the standard scalar Passarino-Veltman integrals(Eq.(4.7) in Ref. [25]), and it could be calculated by using 'LoopTools'.

In Fig.1(a), when one-loop diagrams are composed by the neutral scalar particles X_i, and charged 2/3 new quarks t', the contribution to the form factors F_L^a and F_R^a are formulated as

$$\begin{aligned}
F_L^a = \frac{i}{16\pi^2}\sum_{i,j,\ l}(&-a_1 m_c(b_1 h_2 m_t C_2 + b_2 h_1 m_{t'_i}(C_0+C_1+2C_2) + 3b_2 h_2 m_{t'_j} C_2)) \\
&+a_2 b_2(h_1 B_0 + (h_1 m_{t'_i}^2 + h_2 m_{t'_i} m_{t'_j})C_0) \\
&+a_2 b_1 m_t(h_2 m_{t'_i}(C_0+C_1+C_2) + h_1 m_{t'_j}(C_1+C_2)) + a_2 b_2 h_1 {m_c}^2 C_2 \\
F_R^a = \frac{i}{16\pi^2}\sum_{i,j,\ l}(&-a_2 m_c(b_1 h_2 m_{t'_i}(C_0+C_1+2C_2) + b_1 h_1 m_{t'_j}(C_1+2C_2) + b_2 h_1 m_t C_2)) \\
&+a_1 b_1(h_2 B_0 + (h_1 m_{t'_i} m_{t'_j} + h_2 m_{t'_i}^2)C_0) \\
&+a_1 b_2 m_t(h_1 m_{t'_i}(C_0+C_1+C_2) + h_2 m_{t'_j}(C_1+C_2)) + a_1 b_1 h_2 {m_c}^2 C_2
\end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

with the Passarino-Veltman integrals

$$\begin{aligned}
&B_0 = B_0(p^2, m_{t'_j}^2, m_{X_l}^2) \\
&\mathrm{C}_0 = \mathrm{C}_0\left(p^2, (2p-p')^2, (p-p')^2, m_{t'_j}^2, m_{X_l}^2, m_{t'_i}^2\right) \\
&\mathrm{C}_{1,2} = \mathrm{C}_{1,2}\left((p-p')^2, (2p-p')^2, p^2, m_{t'_i}^2, m_{t'_j}^2, m_{X_l}^2\right)
\end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

and the relevant coefficients are

$$\begin{aligned}
&a_1 = \lambda_1^*(W_{t'}^\dagger)_{2i}(Z_X^\dagger)_{l1}, \qquad a_2 = \lambda_2(U_{t'}^\dagger)_{2i}(Z_X)_{2l}, \\
&b_1 = \lambda_2^*(U_{t'})_{j2}(Z_X^\dagger)_{l2}, \qquad b_2 = \lambda_1(W_{t'})_{j2}(Z_X)_{1l}, \\
&h_1 = Y_{u_4}(U_{t'}^\dagger)_{i1}(W_{t'})_{2j}\cos\alpha + Y_{u_5}(U_{t'}^\dagger)_{i2}(W_{t'})_{1j}\sin\alpha, \\
&h_2 = Y_{u_4}(W_{t'}^\dagger)_{i2}(U_{t'})_{1j}\cos\alpha + Y_{u_5}(W_{t'}^\dagger)_{i1}(U_{t'})_{2j}\sin\alpha,
\end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

In Fig.1(b), when one-loop diagrams are composed by the superpartners $\widetilde{t'}$ and $\widetilde{X}$, F_L^b and F_R^b are formulated as



FIG. 2: The self-energy diagrams contributing to the $t \to ch$ decay in BLMSSM.

$$F_L^b = \frac{i}{16\pi^2}\sum_{i,j}(a_4 b_4 m_{\tilde{X}} C_0 - a_3 b_4 m_c C_1 - a_4 b_3 m_t C_2)(\cos\alpha\xi_u - \sin\alpha\xi_d)$$
$$F_R^b = \frac{i}{16\pi^2}\sum_{i,j}(a_4 b_4 m_{\tilde{X}} C_0 - a_3 b_4 m_c C_1 - a_4 b_3 m_t C_2)(\cos\alpha\xi_u - \sin\alpha\xi_d) \qquad (20)$$

with

$$\mathrm{C}_0{=}\mathrm{C}_0\left(p^2, p'^2, (p-p')^2, m^2_{\tilde{t}'_i}, m^2_{\tilde{X}}, m^2_{\tilde{t}'_j}\right)$$
$$\mathrm{C}_{1,2}{=}\mathrm{C}_{1,2}\left(p^2, (p-p')^2, p'^2, m^2_{\tilde{X}}, m^2_{\tilde{t}'_i}, m^2_{\tilde{t}'_j}\right) \qquad (21)$$

and the relevant coefficients are

$$a_3 = \lambda_2^*(Z^\dagger_{\tilde{t}'})_{i4}, \qquad a_4 = \lambda_1(Z^\dagger_{\tilde{t}'})_{i3},$$
$$b_3 = \lambda_1^*(Z_{\tilde{t}'})_{3j}, \qquad b_4 = \lambda_2(Z_{\tilde{t}'})_{4j}, \qquad (22)$$

In Fig.2 we present the relevant self-energy diagrams of the rare decay $t \to ch$ in BLMSSM.

As in Ref.[8], it is convenient to define the following structure:

$$\Sigma_{tc}(k) \equiv \not{k}\Sigma_L(k^2)P_L + \not{k}\Sigma_R(k^2)P_R + m_t(\Sigma_{Ls}(k^2)P_L + \Sigma_{Rs}(k^2)P_R). \qquad (23)$$

Here m_t factor is inserted there only to preserve the same dimensionality for the different Σ[8]. And the effective interaction vertex of the mixed self-energy diagrams could be taken on the following general form in terms of the various Σ.

$$
\begin{aligned}
-iT_{Sc} = & \frac{-igm_t}{2m_W \sin\beta} \frac{1}{m_c^2 - m_t^2} \bar{c}(p) \, \{ \\
& (P_L \cos\alpha [m_c^2 \Sigma_R(m_c^2) + m_c m_t (\Sigma_{Rs}(m_c^2) + \Sigma_L(m_c^2)) + m_t^2 \Sigma_{Ls}(m_c^2)] \\
& + P_R \cos\alpha [L \leftrightarrow R] \} \, t(p') \\
-iT_{St} = & \frac{-igm_c}{2m_W \sin\beta} \frac{m_t}{m_c^2 - m_t^2} \bar{c}(p) \, \{ \\
& (P_L \cos\alpha [m_t (\Sigma_L(m_t^2) + \Sigma_{Rs}(m_t^2)) + m_c (\Sigma_R(m_t^2) + \Sigma_{Ls}(m_t^2))] \\
& + P_R \cos\alpha [L \leftrightarrow R] \} \, t(p')
\end{aligned} \tag{24}
$$

Comparing with Eq. 16, the corresponding contribution to the form factors F_L and F_R is transparent.

Using the couplings above, we could get the Σ of self-energy diagrams in Fig.2(a) is

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Sigma_L(k^2) &= \frac{i}{16\pi^2} \sum_{i,\ l} a_1 b_2 (B_0(k^2, m_{X_l}^2, m_{t'}^2) + B_1(k^2, m_{X_l}^2, m_{t'}^2)) \\
\Sigma_R(k^2) &= \frac{i}{16\pi^2} \sum_{i,\ l} a_2 b_1 (B_0(k^2, m_{X_l}^2, m_{t'}^2) + B_1(k^2, m_{X_l}^2, m_{t'}^2)) \\
m_t \Sigma_{Ls}(k^2) &= \frac{i}{16\pi^2} \sum_{i,\ l} a_2 b_2 m_{t'} B_0(k^2, m_{X_l}^2, m_{t'}^2) \\
m_t \Sigma_{Rs}(k^2) &= \frac{i}{16\pi^2} \sum_{i,\ l} a_1 b_1 m_{t'} B_0(k^2, m_{X_l}^2, m_{t'}^2)
\end{aligned} \tag{25}
$$

with $B_{0,1}$ are the two-point functions. Similarly, the the Σ of self-energy diagrams in Fig.2(b) have the form:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Sigma_L(k^2) &= \frac{i}{16\pi^2} \sum_{i} a_3 b_4 (B_0(k^2, m_{\tilde{t}'}^2, m_{\tilde{X}}^2) + B_1(k^2, m_{\tilde{t}'}^2, m_{\tilde{X}}^2)) \\
\Sigma_R(k^2) &= \frac{i}{16\pi^2} \sum_{i} a_4 b_3 (B_0(k^2, m_{\tilde{t}'}^2, m_{\tilde{X}}^2) + B_1(k^2, m_{\tilde{t}'}^2, m_{\tilde{X}}^2)) \\
m_t \Sigma_{Ls}(k^2) &= \frac{i}{16\pi^2} \sum_{i} a_4 b_4 m_{\tilde{t}'} B_0(k^2, m_{\tilde{t}'}^2, m_{\tilde{X}}^2) \\
m_t \Sigma_{Rs}(k^2) &= \frac{i}{16\pi^2} \sum_{i} a_3 b_3 m_{\tilde{t}'} B_0(k^2, m_{\tilde{t}'}^2, m_{\tilde{X}}^2)
\end{aligned} \tag{26}
$$

IV. NUMERICAL ANALYSIS

In general case, the partial widths of $t \to ch$ process are[8]

$$\Gamma(t \to ch) = \frac{g^2}{32\pi m_t^3}\lambda^{1/2}(m_t^2, m_h^2, m_c^2) \times \left[\left(m_t^2 + m_c^2 - m_h^2\right)\left(|F_L|^2 + |F_R|^2\right) + 2m_t m_c\left(F_L F_R^* + F_L^* F_R\right)\right] \quad (27)$$

with $\lambda(x^2, y^2, z^2) = (x^2 - (y+z)^2)(x^2 - (y-z)^2)$ is the usual Källen function, and

$$F_L = F_L^{BLSSM} + F_L^{MSSM} + F_L^{SM}$$
$$F_R = F_R^{BLSSM} + F_R^{MSSM} + F_R^{SM} \quad (28)$$

In our calculation,we will use the form factors of MSSM $F_{L,R}^{MSSM}$ mentioned in[8]. And since the contributions of SM is too small, about 10^{-13}[7], so we ignore the form factors of SM.

To compute the branching ratio, we take the SM charged-current two-body decay $t \to bW$ to be the dominant t-quark decay mode, which is $\Gamma(t \to bW^+) = 1.466|V_{tb}|^2$. We will then approximate the branching ratio by

$$Br(t \to ch) = \frac{\Gamma(t \to ch)}{\Gamma(t \to bW^+)} \quad (29)$$

To reduce the number of free parameters in our numerical analysis, the parameters are adopted as Ref.[23, 24]. In this choice, it is easy for the 2×2 CP-even Higgs mass squared matrix to predict the lightest eigenvector with a mass 125.9 GeV, and the choice is good for the behavior of $h \to \gamma\gamma$ and $h \to VV^*$ $(V = Z,\ W)$.[23]



FIG. 3: The branching ratio of $t \to ch$ varying with $m_{\tilde{Q}_4}$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&B_4 = \frac{3}{2}, \quad v_{B_t} = \sqrt{v_B^2 + \bar{v}_B^2} = 3\text{TeV}, \\
&\tan\beta = \tan\beta_B = 2, \\
&m_{\tilde{U}_4} = m_{\tilde{Q}_5} = m_{\tilde{U}_5} = 1\text{TeV}, \\
&A_{u_4} = A_{u_5} = 500\text{GeV}, \\
&A_{BU} = 1\text{TeV}, \ \ \lambda_u = 0.5, \\
&Y_{u_4} = 0.76 Y_t, \ \ Y_{d_4} = 0.7 Y_b, \\
&Y_{u_5} = 0.7 Y_b, \quad Y_{d_5} = 0.13 Y_t, \\
&\mu = -800\text{GeV} \\
&B_X = 500\text{GeV}, \ \ \mu_X = 2\text{TeV},
\end{aligned}
\tag{30}
$$

Choosing $m_{Z_B} = 1\text{TeV}, \mu_B = 500\text{GeV}, \lambda_Q = 0.5, A_{BQ} = 1\text{TeV}$. We plot in Fig.3 the



FIG. 4: The branching ratio of $t \to ch$ versus m_{Z_B}

BRs of $t \to ch$ versus $m_{\tilde{Q}_4}$, the solid line ,dash line and dot line correspond to $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = 0.6, 0.4, 0.2$, respectively. We could see that the BRs decrease as $m_{\tilde{Q}_4}$ runs from 700GeV to 1300GeV, and increase when $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2$ increase, because $m_{\tilde{Q}_4}$ is the mass parameter of the exotic quarks, and λ_1, λ_2 proportional to the coupling coefficient. In addition, when $m_{\tilde{Q}_4} \geq 1100$, the BRs is tend to the results of MSSM.

In Fig. 4, we plot Br$(t \to ch)$ varying with m_{Z_B}. Adopting $m_{\tilde{Q}_4} = 790\text{GeV}, \mu_B = 500\text{GeV}, \lambda_Q = 0.5, A_{BQ} = 1\text{TeV}$, and with $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = 0.6$(solid line), $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = 0.4$(dash line), $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = 0.2$(dot line). We could see that the BRs decrease as m_{Z_B} runs from 800GeV to 1100GeV, since m_{Z_B} contribute to the mass matrix of exotic squarks, and increase when $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2$ increase. And when $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = 0.6, 0.4$, Br$(t \to ch)$ is at the order of 10^{-4}, when $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = 0.2$, Br$(t \to ch)$ is at the order of 10^{-5}.

We assume $m_{\tilde{Q}_4} = 790\text{GeV}, m_{Z_B} = 1\text{TeV}, \lambda_Q = 0.5, A_{BQ} = 1\text{TeV}$. We plot in Fig.5 the BRs of $t \to ch$ versus μ_B, the solid line ,dash line and dot line correspond to $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 =$



FIG. 5: The branching ratio of $t \to ch$ as a function of μ_B

$0.6, 0.4, 0.2$, respectively. We could see that the BRs increase as μ_B runs from 300GeV to 600GeV, since μ_B inversely to the mass of exotic squarks,

Choosing $m_{\tilde{Q}_4} = 790\text{GeV}, m_{Z_B} = 1\text{TeV}, \mu_B = 500\text{GeV}, A_{BQ} = 1\text{TeV}$, we draw $\text{Br}(t \to ch)$ varying with λ_Q in Fig.6 for $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = 0.6, 0.4, 0.2$ respectively. We could see that the curve first increase and then decrease, but not significantly, since λ_Q contribute both to the mass of exotic squarks and the coupling coefficient, .

Taking $m_{\tilde{Q}_4} = 790\text{GeV}, m_{Z_B} = 1\text{TeV}, \mu_B = 500\text{GeV}, \lambda_Q = 0.5$, we show the $\text{Br}(t \to ch)$ varying with A_{BQ} in Fig.7 for $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = 0.6$(solid line), $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = 0.4$(dash line), $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = 0.2$(dot line), respectively. We could see that the BRs decrease as A_{BQ} runs from 1TeV to 1.8TeV, since A_{BQ} contribute to the mass matrix of exotic squarks. And when $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = 0.6, 0.4$, $\text{Br}(t \to ch)$ is at the order of 10^{-4}, when $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = 0.2$, $\text{Br}(t \to ch)$ is at the order of 10^{-5}.



FIG. 6: The branching ratio of $t \to ch$ varying with λ_Q

V. SUMMARY

The running LHC is a top-quark factory, and provides a great opportunity to seek out top-quark decays. And it is showed that the channel $t \to ch$ could be detectable reaching a sensitivity level of $\mathrm{Br}(t \to ch) \sim 5 \times 10^{-5}$ [26, 27]. But the fact is that the branching ratio of the process is so small in the SM[8], which is $\mathrm{Br}(\mathrm{t} \to \mathrm{ch}) \sim 10^{-13}$, so it is too small to be measurable in the near future.

In this work, we study the rare top decay to a 125GeV Higgs in the framework of the BLMSSM. Adopting reasonable assumptions on the parameter space, we present the radiative correction to the process in BLMSSM, and draw some curves between the BRs and new physics parameters. We get the branching ratio of $t \to ch$ can reach 10^{-3}, so this process could be detected in near future at LHC.



FIG. 7: The branching ratio of $t \to ch$ versus A_{BQ}

In addition, the author of [28] yields an estimated upper limit of $\mathrm{Br}(t \to ch) < 2.7\%$ for a Higgs boson mass of 125GeV, by combining the CMS results from a number of exclusive three- and four-lepton search channels. And the ATLAS find the limit of $\mathrm{Br}(t \to ch) < 0.83\%$ at 95% C.L. by searching for $t \to ch$, with $h \to \gamma\gamma$, in $\bar{t}t$ events.[29, 30] And our numerical evaluations indicates the BRs is highly dependent upon the parameters $\lambda_{1,2}$, the sensitive parameters can make the contribution to $\mathrm{Br}(t \to ch)$ sizeable. Considering the experiment upper bounds from CMS and ATLAS, the parameters $\lambda_{1,2}$ should not be too large under our assumptions of the parameter space.

As we could see above, the $t \to ch$ process may be found in near future, and further more constraints of BLMSSM can be obtained from more precise determinations.

Acknowledgments

The work has been supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (NNSFC) with Grant No. 11275036, No. 11047002, the open project of State Key Laboratory of Mathematics-Mechanization with Grant No. Y3KF311CJ1, the Natural Science Foundation of Hebei province with Grant No. A2013201277, and Natural Science Fund of Hebei University with Grant No. 2011JQ05, No. 2012-242.

---

[1] CMS Collaboration, Phys. Lett. B 716 (2012) 30.

[2] ATLAS Collaboration, Phys. Lett. B 716 (2012) 1.

[3] P. Fileviez Perez and M.B. Wise, Breaking local baryon and lepton number at the TeV scale, JHEP 08 (2011) 068 [arXiv:1106.0343]

[4] P. Fileviez Perez and M.B. Wise, Baryon and lepton number as local gauge symmetries, Phys. Rev. D 82 (2010) 011901 [Erratum ibid. D 82 (2010) 079901] [arXiv:1002.1754]

[5] B. Mele, S. Petrarca, A. Soddu, Phys. Lett. B 435 (1998) 401.

[6] G. Eilam, J.L. Hewett, A. Soni, Phys. Rev. D 59 (1998) 039901, Erratum.

[7] G. Eilam, J.L. Hewett, A. Soni, Phys. Rev. D 44 (1991) 1473.

[8] Jaume Guasch, Joan Solà. Nuclear Physics B 562 (1999) 3-28.

[9] Junjie Cao, Chengcheng Han, Lei Wu, Jin Min Yang, Mengchao Zhang. [1404.1241].

[10] J. Rosiek, Phys.Rev. D 41 (1990) 3464; arXiv:hep-ph/9511250;

[11] Tai-Fu Feng, Xiu-Yi Yang, Nucl.Phys. B 814 (2009) 101;

[12] H.P. Nilles, Phys. Rept. 110 (1984) 1;

[13] H.E. Haber and G.L. Kane, Phys. Rept. 117 (1985);

[14] P. Minkoski, Phys. Lett. B 67 (1977) 421;

[15] R.N. Mohapatra, G. Senjanovic, Phys. Rev. Lett. 44 (1980) 912.

[16] P.F. Perez, Phys. Lett. B 711 (2012) 353.

[17] J.M. Arnold, P.F. Perez, B. Fornal, S. Spinner, Phys. Rev. D 85 (2012) 115024.

[18] Supersymmetry searches at CMS webpage, http://cms.web.cern.ch/org/cms-papers-and-results.

[19] Supersymmetry searches at ATLAS webpage, https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/bin/view/AtlasPublic/SupersymmetryPublicResults.

[20] P. Fileviez Perez and S. Spinner, Supersymmetry at the LHC and the theory of R-parity, arXiv:1308.0524

[21] P. Fileviez Perez and M.B. Wise, Low energy supersymmetry with baryon and lepton number gauged, Phys. Rev. D 84 (2011) 055015 [arXiv:1105.3190]

[22] J.M. Butterworth, J.R. Ellis, A.R. Raklev and G.P. Salam, Discovering baryon-number violating neutralino decays at the LHC, Phys. Rev. Lett. 103 (2009) 241803 [arXiv:0906.0728]

[23] Tai-Fu Feng, Shu-Min Zhao, Hai-Bin Zhang, Yin-Jie Zhang, Yu-Li Yan, Nucl.Phys. B 871 (2013) 223.

[24] Shu-Min Zhao, Tai-Fu Feng, Ben Yan, Hai-Bin Zhang, Yin-Jie Zhang, Biao Chen, Xue-Qian Li. arXiv:1306.0664

[25] A. Denner, Fortschr. Phys. 41 307 (1993)

[26] J. A. Aguilar-Saavedra and G. C. Branco, Phys. Lett. B 495, 347 (2000).

[27] G. Eilam, A. Gemintern, T. Han, J.M. Yang, X. Zhang. Phys.Lett. B510 (2001) 227-235 [arXiv:hep-ph/0102037]

[28] Nathaniel Craig, Jared A. Evans, Richard Gray, Michael Park, Sunil Somalwar, Scott Thomas, Matthew Walker . PhysRevD.86.075002, [arXiv:1207.6794]

[29] ATLAS- CONF- 2013-081 [ATLAS Collaboration]

[30] Kai-Feng Chen, Wei-Shu Hou, Chung Kao, Masaya Kohda,[arXiv:1304.8037]